



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/624,445	07/24/2000	Stephen Uhler	P5297/RSB	5723

32615 7590 05/31/2005

OSHA LIANG L.L.P./SUN
1221 MCKINNEY, SUITE 2800
HOUSTON, TX 77010

EXAMINER

ANYA, CHARLES E

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2194

DATE MAILED: 05/31/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/624,445

Applicant(s)

UHLER ET AL.

Examiner

Charles E. Anya

Art Unit

2194

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08 November 2004.
2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3,6-9,11 and 13-28 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3,6-9,11 and 13-28 is/are rejected.
7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-3,6-9,11 and 13-28 are pending in this application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. **Claims 1-3,6-9,11 and 13-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Pat. No. 6,233,622 to Atsatt et al. in view of U.S. Pat. No. 6,757,900 to Burd et al.**

4. As to claim 1, Atsatt teaches a framework for creating an extensible Web application, comprising: a server object configured to receive a request for the a extensible Web application, (Web Demon 20 Col. 3 Ln. 1 - 67, Adapter 22 Col. 3 Ln. 11-54, Server 16 Col. 3 Ln. 1 - 67), a request object configured to be called by the server object upon receiving the request (Request Object 26 Col. 4 Ln. 28 - 67), a first handler object, configured to respond to the request using the request object (Handler 24 (24a, 24b, 24c) Col. 3 Ln. 19 - 67, Col. 4 Ln. 1 - 67).
5. Atsatt is silent with reference to a properties object comprising information used by the first handler object, the server object and the request object to respond to the

request and the properties object includes a data dictionary, wherein the data dictionary comprises at least one attribute-value pair.

6. Burd teaches a properties object comprising information used by the first handler object, the server object and the request object to respond to the request and the properties object includes a data dictionary, wherein the data dictionary comprises at least one attribute-value pair ("...hash table..." Col. 20 Ln. 15 - 21).

7. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Burd and Atsatt because the teaching of Burd would improve the system of Atsatt by providing the state information of the control object/handler object (Col. 5 Ln. 11 - 18, Col. 20 Ln. 15 - 21).

8. As to claim 2, Although an initialization method and a handler name is not explicitly taught these limitations are inherent because in order for the handler object to process a request resources (e.g. memory), it must have to be allocated to the handler object and the handler object inherently has an identifier otherwise it would be impossible for the adapter object to pass the request object to the handler object.

9. As to claim 3, Atsatt teaches the step of the handler object creating/instantiating additional/second handler object (Handler 24 Col. 4 Ln. 1 - 9, IRemoteHandler Col. 10 Ln. 1 - 9).

10. As to claim 6, Burd teaches the first handler object is configured to modify the properties object to obtain a modified request object (Col. 5 Ln. 3 - 18).

11. As to claim 7, Atsatt teaches a method of operating a web application comprising the step of creating a server object (Col. 9 Ln. 16 - 25), the step of creating a handler object (Col. 4 Ln. 12 - 17, Block 36 Col. 5 Ln. 1 - 7), receiving an indication of a request (Col. 3 Ln. 37 - 47), creating a request object in response to receiving the indication (Col. 4 Ln. 31 - 35: NOTE: Atsatt does not explicitly show the step of creating a request object in response to receiving the indication however this is inherent because the adapter receives the input data before the creation of a request object), a response method (Block 46 Col. 5 Ln. 37 - 41) and the step of calling methods of the request object to obtain the request at the port (Col. 4 Ln. 46 - 50: NOTE: A port is inherent because the URLS includes port number that a web server is running on).

12. Atsatt is silent with reference to a properties object, wherein the properties object includes a data dictionary, and wherein the data dictionary comprises at least one attribute-value pair.

13. Burd teaches to a properties object, wherein the properties object includes a data dictionary, and wherein the data dictionary comprises at least one attribute-value pair ("...hash table..." Col. 20 Ln. 15 - 21).

14. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Burd and Atsatt because the teaching of

Burd would improve the system of Atsatt by providing the state information of the control object/handler object (Col. 5 Ln. 11 - 18, Col. 20 Ln. 15 - 21).

15. As to claim 8, see the rejection of claim 3 above.
16. As to claim 9, see the rejection of claims 1 and 7 above.
17. As to claims 11 and 13, see the rejection of claims 3 and 9.
18. As to claim 14, see the rejection of claim 1 above.
19. As to claim 15, Atsatt teaches the step where a handler object is called to respond to a request embodied in the request object (Col. 4 Ln. 42 - 50).
20. As to claim 16, claims 1,3 and 9 above.
21. As to claim 17, see the rejection of claim 1.
22. As to claim 18, see the rejection of claims 3 and 9 above.
23. As to claim 19, see the rejection of claim 6 above.

Art Unit: 2194

24. As to claim 20, Atsatt teaches a method of communicating with a device comprising: receiving an HTTP request from the requester (Col. 3 Ln. 4 - 10), extracting request information from the HTTP request wherein the request information includes commands for interacting with the device ("...extracts..." Col. 3 Ln. 11 - 47) and calling a handler object with the request information/invoking the commands on the device/receiving device information from the device, and returning device information to the requester (Col. 3 Ln. 48 - 65).

25. Atsatt is silent with reference to the handler object using information from a properties object, wherein the properties includes a data dictionary, wherein the a data dictionary comprises at least one attribute-value pair.

26. Burd teaches the handler object using information from a properties object, wherein the properties object includes a data dictionary, wherein the data dictionary comprises at least one attribute-value pair ("...hash table..." Col. 20 Ln. 15 - 21).

27. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Burd and Atsatt because the teaching of Burd would improve the system of Atsatt by providing the state information of the control object/handler object (Burd Col. 5 Ln. 11 - 18, Col. 20 Ln. 15 - 21).

28. As to claim 21, Atsatt teaches the request object being configured to obtain and parse the request (Request Object 26 Col. 4 Ln. 10 - 67).

29. As to claim 22, see the rejection of claim 3 above.

30. As to claim 23, Atsatt teaches the request object that includes information related to the request (Request Object Col. 4 Ln. 31 - 40).

31. As to claim 24, see the rejection of claim 6 above.

32. As to claim 25, see the rejection of claim 1 above.

33. As to claim 26, Atsatt teaches formulating a response to the request ("...response..." Col. 3 Ln. 54 - 65, Reply Object 28 Col. 4 Ln. 11 - 50).

34. As to claim 27, Atsatt teaches a method for processing a request from a web application comprising: receiving a the request by the server object (Web Demon 20 Col. 3 Ln. 1 - 67, Adapter 22 Col. 3 Ln. 11 - 54, Server 16 Col. 3 Ln. 1 - 67), generating a request object to manage processing of the request (Request Object 26 Col. 4 Ln. 28 - 67) and forwarding the request using a handler object/processing the request using the handler object (Handler 24 (24a, 24b, 24c) Col. 3 Ln. 19 - 67, Col. 4 Ln. 1 - 67).

35. Atsatt silent with reference to processing the request using the handler object comprises sequentially invoking a plurality of interior node handler objects, wherein each of the plurality of interior handler objects processes a portion of the request to obtain a partial result and storing the partial result in a properties object.

36. Burd teaches processing the request using the handler object comprises sequentially invoking a plurality of interior node handler objects, wherein each of the plurality of interior handler objects processes a portion of the request to obtain a partial result and storing the partial result in a properties object ("...server-side control object/page object..." Col. 4 Ln. 48 - 67, Col. 6 Ln. 1 - 34, Col. 8 Ln. 14 - 28, Col. 12 Ln. 39 - 67).

37. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Burd and Atsatt because the teaching of Burd would improve the system of Atsatt by providing hierarchy of control objects that fulfill different aspects of an HTTP request (Burd Col. 12 Ln. 39 - 67).

38. As to claim 28, see the rejection of claim 27 above.

Response to Arguments

39. Applicant's arguments filed 11/24/04 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

40. Applicant argues in substance that (1) there is no motivation to combine the prior art references, (2) the Burd does not teach that the attribute-value pair contains necessary attributes of objects that are used by handler object(s) when answering client requests, since the Limited Object Serialization (LOS) is not used by the handler objects to answer client requests (3) the Burd prior art reference does not teach a web application designed to modularly process a request such that the request is passed

through a series of handler objects, where each object performs a simple task and then forwarding the request to the next module or handler object and (4) the Burd prior art reference does not teach or suggest that control objects processing the request produce partial results.

Examiner respectfully traverse Applicant's argument:

As to point (1), In response to applicant's argument that there is no suggestion to combine the references, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. In this case the Examiner cites column 5 lines 11 – 18, column 20 lines 15 – 21 of the Burd prior art reference as teaching the motivation to combine.

As to point (2) contrary to Applicant argument Burd teach that "...LOS format specifies a hash table of name/value pairs for each control object, wherein each hash entry contains either state information for a property of the control object or a nested hash table of a child control object..." (Col. 20 Ln. 15 – 21). This state information as taught by the Burd prior art reference ("...the state information is added to the transportation data structure for transmission to the client...") implies that the LOS is used to respond to client's requests (Col. 5 Ln. 20 – 22).

As to point (3), Burd does indeed teach web application designed to modularly process a request such that the request is passed through a series of handler

objects, where each handler object performs a simple task and then forwarding the request to the next module or handler object by providing a hierarchy of server-side control objects that **corporate** to process request received from a client and then generating web page content for transmission to the client (Col. 4 Ln. 55 – 59).

As to point (4), by providing a hierarchy of server-side control objects that **corporate** to process requests the Burd prior art reference inherently includes one or more server-side control objects that process requests and produce partial results.

Conclusion

41. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Charles E. Anya whose telephone number is (571) 272-3757. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (8:30-6:00) First Friday off.


Art Unit: 2194

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, An Meng-Ai can be reached on (571) 272-3756. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Charles E Anya
Examiner
Art Unit 2194

cea.


MENG-AL T. AN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100